

Quantum computational logic with mixed states

HECTOR FREYTES^{*†,1} AND GRACIELA DOMENECH^{‡,2}

1. Università di Cagliari, Dipartimento di Scienze Pedagogiche e Filosofiche,
Via Is Mirrionis 1,09123, Cagliari-Italia
2. Instituto de Astronomía y Física del Espacio (IAFE)
Casilla de Correo 67, Sucursal 28, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina

Abstract

Using an algebraic framework we solve a problem posed in [5] and [7] about the axiomatizability of a type quantum computational logic related to fuzzy logic. A Hilbert-style calculus is developed obtaining an algebraic strong completeness theorem.

Keywords: quantum computational logic, fuzzy logic, PMV-algebras.
Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 06B99, 03B52, 06D35.

Introduction

In the 1980s, Richard Feynman suggested that a quantum computer based on quantum logic would evenly simulate quantum mechanical systems. His ideas have spawned an active area of research in physics which gave rise, in turn, to different logical approaches to quantum computation. Quantum systems can simulate all computations which can be done by classical systems; however, one of the main advantages of quantum computation and quantum algorithms is that they can speed up computations [25].

Standard quantum computing is based on quantum systems with finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, specially $\mathbb{C}^2$, the two-dimensional state space of

^{*}Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas: Instituto Argentino de Matemática (IAM), Saavedra 15 - 3er Piso - 1083 Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[†]Corresponding author Email: hfreytes@gmail.com

[‡]Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas.

a *qbit*. A qbit state (the quantum counterpart of the classical bit) is represented by a unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and, generalizing for a positive integer n , n -*qbits* are pure states represented by unit vectors in $\mathbb{C}^{2^n}$. They conform the information units in quantum computation. These state spaces only concerned with the “static” part of quantum computing and possible logical systems can be founded in the Birkhoff and von Neumann quantum logic based on the Hilbert lattices $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{2^n})$ [11]. Similarly to the classical computing case, we can introduce and study the behavior of a number of *quantum logical gates* (hereafter quantum gates for short) operating on qbits, giving rise to “new forms” of quantum logic. These gates are mathematically represented by *unitary operators* on the appropriate Hilbert spaces of qbits. In other words, standard quantum computation is mathematically founded on “*qbits-unitary operators*” and only takes into account reversible processes. This framework can be generalized to a powerful mathematical representation of quantum computation in which the qbit states are replaced by *density operators* over Hilbert spaces and unitary operators by linear operators acting over endomorphisms of Hilbert spaces called *quantum operations*. The new model “*density operators-quantum operations*” also called “*quantum computation with mixed states*” ([1, 32]) is equivalent in computational power to the standard one but gives a place to irreversible processes as measurements in the middle of the computation.

In [5] and [7], a quantum gate system called *Poincaré irreversible quantum computational system* (for short $\mathcal{IP}$ -system) was developed. Recently it was proved that the mentioned quantum gates system can be seen in the framework given by “density operators - quantum operations” [14]. The $\mathcal{IP}$ -system is an interesting quantum gates system specially for two reasons: it is related to continuous t -norms and subsequent generalizations allow to connect this system with sequential effect algebras [17], introduced to study the sequential action of quantum effects which are unsharp versions of quantum events [18, 19].

Our study is motivated by the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system, and mainly by the following question proposed by the authors in [5] and [7]:

“*The axiomatizability of quantum computational logic is an open problem.*”

More precisely, in this paper we study the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system from a logic-algebraic perspective. A Hilbert-style calculus is develop obtaining a strong completeness theorem respect to probabilistic semantics associated with the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system. The paper is structured as follows: Section 1 contains generalities on universal algebra and algebraic structures associated with fuzzy

logic. In Section 2, we briefly resume basic physical notions of mathematical approaches to quantum computation, with emphases in the approach of “density operators - quantum operations”. This formalism allows to build probabilistic models for quantum computational logics with mixed states and provides the formal connection between the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system and fuzzy logics based on continuous t -norms. In Section 3, algebraic structures associated to quantum computation are introduced. Specifically, we give an expansion of the equational class known as square root quasi MV -algebras, expansion that we call “square root quasi PMV -algebra” (or $\sqrt{q}PMV$ -algebra for short). In Section 4 we study a subvariety of $\sqrt{q}PMV$ -algebras called *Irreversible Poincaré Algebras*. They constitute the algebraic framework for the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system. Finally, in Section 5 we give a Hilbert-style calculus based on probabilistic models related to the $\mathcal{IP}$ -system and we develop a “non standard” method of algebrization of this calculus which allows to obtain an algebraic strong completeness theorem.

1 Basic notions

We freely use all basic notions of universal algebra that can be found in [4]. Let σ be a type of algebras and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a class of algebras of type σ . For all algebras A, B in $\mathcal{A}$, $[A, B]_{\mathcal{A}}$ will denote the set of all $\mathcal{A}$ -homomorphisms. An algebra A in $\mathcal{A}$ is *injective* iff for every monomorphism $f \in [B, C]_{\mathcal{A}}$ and every $g \in [B, A]_{\mathcal{A}}$ there exists $h \in [C, A]_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $hf = g$. We denote by $Term_{\mathcal{A}}$ the absolutely free algebra of type σ built from the set of variables $V = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$. Each element of $Term_{\mathcal{A}}$ is referred as an $\mathcal{A}$ -term. For $t \in Term_{\mathcal{A}}$ we often write t as $t(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ to indicate that the variables occurring in t are among $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. If $t(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in Term_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, by $t^A[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ we denote the result of the application of the term operation t^A to the elements $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$. A *valuation* in A is a map $v : V \rightarrow A$. Of course, any valuation v in A can be uniquely extended to an $\mathcal{A}$ -homomorphism $v : Term_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow A$ in the usual way, i.e., if $t_1, \dots, t_n \in Term_{\mathcal{A}}$ then $v(t(t_1, \dots, t_n)) = t^A(v(t_1), \dots, v(t_n))$. Thus, valuations are identified with $\mathcal{A}$ -homomorphisms from the absolutely free algebra. If $t, s \in Term_{\mathcal{A}}$, $A \models t = s$ means that for each valuation v in A , $v(t) = v(s)$ and $\mathcal{A} \models t = s$ means that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \models t = s$.

Now we introduce some basic notions in algebraic structures associated to fuzzy logic. An *MV-algebra* [6] is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, 0 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 0 \rangle$

satisfying the following equations:

MV1 $\langle A, \oplus, 0 \rangle$ is an abelian monoid,

MV2 $\neg\neg x = x$,

MV3 $x \oplus \neg 0 = \neg 0$,

MV4 $\neg(\neg x \oplus y) \oplus y = \neg(\neg y \oplus x) \oplus x$.

We denote by $\mathcal{MV}$ the variety of MV -algebras. In agreement with the usual MV -algebraic operations we define

$$\begin{aligned} x \odot y &= \neg(\neg x \oplus \neg y), & x \rightarrow y &= \neg x \oplus y, \\ x \wedge y &= x \odot (x \rightarrow y), & x \vee y &= (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y, \\ 1 &= \neg 0. \end{aligned}$$

On each MV -algebra A we can define an order $x \leq y$ iff $x \rightarrow y = 1$. This order turns $\langle A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1 \rangle$ in a distributive bounded lattice with 1 the greatest element and 0 the smallest element.

A very important example of MV -algebra is $[0, 1]_{MV} = \{[0, 1], \oplus, \neg, 0\}$ such that $[0, 1]$ is the real unit segment and $\oplus$ and $\neg$ are defined as follows:

$$x \oplus y = \min(1, x + y) \quad \neg x = 1 - x$$

The derivate operations in $[0, 1]_{MV}$ are given by $x \odot y = \max(0, x + y - 1)$ (called Łukasiewicz t-norm) and $x \rightarrow y = \min(1, 1 - x + y)$. Finally the MV -lattice structure is the natural order in $[0, 1]$.

Let A be an MV -algebra. We define for all $a \in A$, $\odot_1 a = a$ and $\odot_{n+1} a = (\odot_n a) \odot a$. An element a in A is called *nilpotent* iff there exists a natural number n such that $\odot_n a = 0$.

Proposition 1.1 [6, Theorem 3.5.1] *For every MV -algebra A , A is simple iff A is no trivial and for each element $x < 1$ in A , x is a nilpotent element.*

□

A *product MV -algebra* [27, 28, 29] (for short: *PMV*-algebra) is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 1, 0 \rangle$ satisfying the following:

1 $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, 0 \rangle$ is an MV -algebra,

2 $\langle A, \bullet, 1 \rangle$ is an abelian monoid,

3 $x \bullet (y \odot \neg z) = (x \bullet y) \odot \neg(x \bullet z)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{PMV}$ the variety of PMV -algebras. In each PMV -algebra A we also define for all $a \in A$, $a^1 = a$ and $a^{n+1} = a^n \bullet a$. Important example of PMV -algebra is $[0, 1]_{MV}$ equipped with the usual multiplication. This algebra is denoted by $[0, 1]_{PMV}$. The following are almost immediate consequences of the definition of PMV -algebras:

Lemma 1.2 *In each PMV -algebra we have*

1. $0 \bullet x = 0$,
2. If $a \leq b$ then $a \bullet x \leq b \bullet x$,
3. $x \odot y \leq x \bullet y \leq x \wedge y$.

□

Two important subalgebras of $[0, 1]_{PMV}$ are $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$ and $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$ the sub PMV -algebra generated by $\frac{1}{2}$.

Lemma 1.3 $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$ is order dense in the real interval $[0, 1]$.

Proof: Let $a, b \in [0, 1]$. We assume that $a < b < \frac{1}{2}$. Let $n_0 \in N$ the first natural such that $\frac{1}{2^{n_0}} \leq a$. Let $n_1 \in N$ such that $\frac{1}{2^{n_1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \min\{b-a, a-\frac{1}{2^{n_0}}\}$. Thus there exists $n \in N$ such that

$$a < s = \frac{1}{2^{n_0}} + \sum_n \frac{1}{2^{n_1}} = \frac{1}{2^{n_0}} + \bigoplus_n \frac{1}{2^{n_1}} < b$$

and by construction $s \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. If $\frac{1}{2} < a < b$ then $\neg b < \neg a < \frac{1}{2}$ since $\neg \frac{1}{2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}$. With the same argument we can choose $s \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$ such $\neg b < s < \neg a$. Thus $a < \neg s = 1 - s < b$. Hence $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$ is order dense in the real interval $[0, 1]$.

□

Proposition 1.4 1. Each PMV -algebra is isomorphic to a subdirect product of linearly ordered PMV -algebras [28, Lemma 2.3].

2. Let A be a PMV-algebra and let B be the underlying MV-algebra. Then A and B have the same congruences. Therefore A is a simple PMV-algebra iff B is a simple MV-algebra [28, Lemma 2.11].
3. $[0, 1]_{PMV}$ is injective in $\mathcal{PMV}$ [15, §3.2].

□

2 From physic to fuzzy logic

2.1 Quantum states

The notion of *state of a physical system* is familiar from its use in classical mechanics, where it is linked to the initial conditions (the initial values of position and momenta) which determine the solutions of the equation of motion of the system. For any value of time, the state is represented by a point in the phase space. In quantum mechanic the description of the state becomes substantially modified. In fact, in quantum mechanics the state embodies the specific history which preceded the instant to which the state refers. As a simple description we may say that:

A state is the result of a series of physical manipulations on the system which constitute the preparation of the state

Quantum mechanics is founded in a set of simple postulates. The first postulate gives a mathematical description of the concept of state and sets up the framework in which quantum mechanics take places: the *Hilbert space*. In fact this postulate reads:

Postulate: A *closed physical system* is a system which is totally isolated from the rest of the world. Associated to any closed physical system is a complex Hilbert space known as *the state space*. The *state* of a closed physical system (or *pure state*) is wholly described by a unit vector in the state space.

In Dirac notation a pure state is denoted by $|\varphi\rangle$. A *quantum bit* or *qbit*, the fundamental concept of quantum computation, is a pure state in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2$. The standard orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$ where $|0\rangle = (1, 0)$ and $|1\rangle = (0, 1)$ is called the *logical basis*. Thus, pure states $|\varphi\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ are coherent superpositions of the the basis vectors with complex coefficients

$$|\psi\rangle = c_0|0\rangle + c_1|1\rangle, \quad \text{with} \quad |c_0|^2 + |c_1|^2 = 1$$

Quantum mechanics reads out the information content of a pure state via the Born rule. By these means, a probability value is assigned to a qbit as follows:

Definition 2.1 [7], [5] Let $|\psi\rangle = c_0|0\rangle + c_1|1\rangle$ be a qbit. Then its *probability value* is $p(|\psi\rangle) = |c_1|^2$

The quantum states of interest in quantum computation lie in the tensor product $\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2 = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ (n times). The space $\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2$ is a 2^n -dimensional complex space. A special basis, called the *2^n -computational basis*, is chosen for $\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2$. More precisely, it consists of the 2^n orthogonal states $|\iota\rangle$, $0 \leq \iota \leq 2^n$ where ι is in binary representation and $|\iota\rangle$ can be seen as tensor product of states (Kronecker product) $|\iota\rangle = |\iota_1\rangle \otimes |\iota_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\iota_n\rangle$ where $\iota_j \in \{0, 1\}$. A pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2$ is a superposition of the basis vectors $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\iota=1}^{2^n} c_\iota |\iota\rangle$ with $\sum_{\iota=1}^{2^n} |c_\iota|^2 = 1$.

In general, a quantum system is not in a pure state. This may be caused, for example, by the non complete efficiency in the preparation procedure and also by manipulations on the system as measurements over pure states, both of which produce statistical mixtures. Moreover, there are operations associated with partially tracing out some degrees of freedom, which give rise to proper mixtures. Besides, systems cannot be completely isolated from the environment, undergoing decoherence of their states. Non pure states, namely *mixed states*, are described by *density operators*. A density operator is represented on the 2^n -dimensional complex Hilbert space by an Hermitian (i.e $\rho^\dagger = \rho$) positive operator with unit trace, $tr(\rho) = 1$. In terms of density matrices, a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ can be represented as a matrix product $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, where $\langle\psi| = |\psi\rangle^\dagger$. As a particular case, we may relate to each vector of the logical basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$ one of the very important density operators $P_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $P_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|$ that represent the falsity-property and the truth-property respectively. Due to the fact that the Pauli matrices:

$$\sigma_0 = I \quad \sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $I = I^{(2)}$ is the 2×2 identity matrix, are a basis for the set of operators over $\mathbb{C}^2$, an arbitrary density operator ρ for n -qbits may be represented in

terms of tensor products of them in the following way:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} P_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} (\sigma_{\mu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\mu_n})$$

where $\mu_i \in \{0, x, y, x\}$ for each $i = 1 \dots n$. The real expansion coefficients $P_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$ are given by $P_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} = \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{\mu_n} \rho)$. Since the eigenvalues of the Pauli matrices are ± 1 , the expansion coefficients satisfy $|P_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}| \leq 1$.

We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2)$ the set of all density operators of $\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2$, hence the set $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i \in N} \mathcal{D}(\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2)$ will represent the set of all possible density operators. Moreover, we can identify in each space $\mathcal{D}(\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2)$, the two special operators $P_0^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(I^{n-1} \otimes P_0)} I^{n-1} \otimes P_0$ and $P_1^{(n)} = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(I^{n-1} \otimes P_1)} I^{n-1} \otimes P_1$ (where n is even and $n \geq 2$) that represent in this framework, the falsity-property and the truth-property respectively. By applying the Born rule, the probability to obtain the truth-property $P_1^{(n)}$ for a system being in the state ρ is given by the following definition:

Definition 2.2 [7], [5] Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2)$. Then its *probability value* is $p(\rho) = \text{Tr}(P_1^{(n)} \rho)$.

Note that, in the particular case in which $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ where $|\psi\rangle = c_0|0\rangle + c_1|1\rangle$, we obtain that $p(\rho) = |c_1|^2$. This definition of probability allows to introduce a binary relation $\leq_w$ on $\mathcal{D}$ in the following way:

$$\sigma \leq_w \rho \quad \text{iff} \quad p(\sigma) \leq p(\rho)$$

One can easily see that $\langle \mathcal{D}, \leq_w \rangle$ is a preorder and it will play an important role in the rest of the paper.

2.2 Probabilistic models for quantum computational logics with mixed states

In the usual representation of quantum computational processes, a quantum circuit is identified with an appropriate composition of *quantum gates*, i.e. unitary operators acting on pure states of a convenient (n -fold tensor product) Hilbert space $\otimes^n \mathbb{C}^2$ [30]. Consequently, quantum gates represent time reversible evolutions of pure states of the system.

But for many reasons this restriction is unduly. On the one hand, it does not encompass realistic physical states described by mixtures, as mentioned above. On the other hand, there are interesting processes that cannot be

encoded in unitary evolutions, as measurements in middle of the process. Several authors [1], [10], [17], [32] have paid attention to a more general model of quantum computational processes, where pure states and unitary operators are replaced by density operators and *quantum operations*, respectively. In this case, time evolution is no longer necessarily reversible.

Let H be a Hilbert space, $\mathcal{L}(H)$ be the vector space of all linear operators on H and $\mathcal{D}(H)$ be the set of density operators. A *quantum operation* [24] is a linear operator $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(H_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_2)$ representable as $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger$ where A_i are operators satisfying $\sum_i A_i^\dagger A_i = I$ (Kraus representation). It can be seen that a quantum operation maps density operators into density operators. Every unitary operator $\mathcal{U}$ on a Hilbert space H gives rise to a quantum operation $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}(\sigma) = \mathcal{U}\sigma\mathcal{U}^\dagger$ for each $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. Thus quantum operations are a generalization of the model of quantum computation based on unitary operators.

Quantum computational logics with mixed states may be presented as a logic $\langle Term, \models \rangle$, where $Term$ is an absolute free algebra, whose natural universe of interpretation is $\mathcal{D}$ and connectives are naturally interpreted as certain quantum operations. More precisely, *canonical interpretations* are $Term$ -homomorphisms $e : Term \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. To define a relation of semantic consequence $\models$ based on the probability assignment, it is necessary to introduce the notion of canonical valuations. In fact, *canonical valuations* are functions over the unitary real interval $f : Term \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that f can be factorized in the following way:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & f & \\ Term & \xrightarrow{\quad} & [0, 1] \\ e \downarrow & \equiv & \nearrow p \\ & \mathcal{D} & \end{array}$$

where p is the probability function in the sense of Definition 2.2. We will refer to these diagrams as *probabilistic models*. Then the semantical consequence $\models$ related to $\mathcal{D}$ is given by:

$$\alpha \models \varphi \text{ iff } \mathcal{R}[f(\alpha), f(\varphi)]$$

where $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [0, 1]^2$ provides a relation between $f(\alpha)$ and $f(\varphi)$.

2.3 Connection with fuzzy logic

As a matter of fact, it can be shown [8] that for some systems of quantum operations (or quantum gates), this type of semantics does not need to con-

sider density operators other than $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ for canonical models. This result smooths things out to considerable extent for such systems, since density operators in $\mathbb{C}^2$ are amenable to the well-known matrix representation

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(I + r_1\sigma_x + r_2\sigma_y + r_3\sigma_z)$$

where r_1, r_2, r_3 are real numbers such that $r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 \leq 1$. When a density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ represents a pure state, it can be identified with a point (r_1, r_2, r_3) on the sphere of radius 1 (Bloch sphere) and each $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ that represents a mixed state with a point in the interior of the Bloch sphere. We denote this identifications as $\rho = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$. An interesting feature of density operators in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is the following: any real number $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, uniquely determines a density operator ρ_λ given by

$$\rho_\lambda = (1 - \lambda)P_0 + \lambda P_1$$

Lemma 2.3 [8, Lemma 6.1] *Let $\rho = (r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then we have:*

1. $p(\rho) = \frac{1-r_3}{2}$.
2. If $\rho = \rho_\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ then $\rho = (0, 0, 1 - 2\lambda)$ and $p(\rho_\lambda) = \lambda$.

□

The connection between quantum computational logic with mixed states and fuzzy logic comes from the election of a system of quantum operations (or quantum gates) such that, when interpreted under probabilistic models, they turn out in some kind of operation in the real interval $[0, 1]$ associated to fuzzy logic as continuous t-norms [20], left-continuous t-norms [12], etc.

The systems presented in [5] and [7], precisely those that motivate our study, are of this kind as will become clear through the rest of the paper. It is not necessary to consider density operators other than $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ for canonical models (see [8]). This quantum gates system reduced to $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is the following:

- $\sigma \oplus \tau = \rho_{p(\sigma) \oplus p(\tau)}$ [Łukasiewicz gate]
- $\sigma \bullet \tau = \rho_{p(\sigma) \cdot p(\tau)}$ [IAND gate]
- $\neg \rho = \sigma_x \rho \sigma_x^\dagger$ [NOT gate]

- $\sqrt{\rho} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+i}{2} & \frac{1-i}{2} \\ \frac{1-i}{2} & \frac{1+i}{2} \end{pmatrix} \rho \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+i}{2} & \frac{1-i}{2} \\ \frac{1-i}{2} & \frac{1+i}{2} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger$ [$\sqrt{NOT}$ gate]
- $P_1, P_0, \rho_{\frac{1}{2}}$ [Constant gates]

We can see that quantum gates $\bullet, \sqrt{}, \neg$ are quantum operations. The Łukasiewicz quantum gate $\oplus$ is not a quantum operation but it can be *probabilistically approximated* in a uniform form by means of quantum operations [14]. Thus we may introduce the following algebraic system associated with the quantum gates known as *the Poincaré irreversible quantum computational algebra* (for short *IP-algebra*):

$$\langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2), \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{}, P_0, \rho_{\frac{1}{2}}, P_1 \rangle$$

The following lemma provides the main properties of the *IP*-algebra that will be captured in an abstract algebraic framework.

Lemma 2.4 [8, Lemma 6.1] and [9, Lemma 3.7] *Let $\tau, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ and let p be the probability function over $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Then we have:*

1. $\langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2), \bullet \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2), \oplus \rangle$ are abelian monoids,
2. $\tau \bullet P_0 = P_0$,
3. $\tau \bullet P_1 = \rho_{p(\tau)}$,
4. $p(\tau \bullet \sigma) = p(\tau)p(\sigma)$,
5. $p(\tau \oplus \sigma) = p(\tau) \oplus p(\sigma)$,
6. $\sqrt{\neg \tau} = \neg \sqrt{\tau}$,
7. $\sqrt{\sqrt{\tau}} = \neg \tau$.

Moreover if $\sigma = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ then

8. $\neg \sigma = (r_1, -r_2, -r_3)$ and $\sqrt{\sigma} = (r_1, -r_3, r_2)$, hence $p(\neg \sigma) = \frac{1+r_3}{2}$ and $p(\sqrt{\sigma}) = \frac{1-r_2}{2}$,
9. $p(\sqrt{\tau \bullet \sigma}) = p(\sqrt{\tau \oplus \sigma}) = \frac{1}{2}$,
10. $\frac{p(\sigma)}{4} \oplus \frac{p(\sqrt{\sigma})}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ iff $r_2^2 + r_3^2 \leq 1$,

$$11. \frac{p(\sigma)}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8} \leq \frac{3}{8} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$$

□

Recalling that in our case the assignment of probability is done via a function $p : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, it is possible to establish the following equivalence relation in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$:

$$\sigma \equiv \tau \quad \text{iff} \quad p(\sigma) = p(\tau)$$

It is clear that this equivalence is strongly related to the preorder $\leq_w$ previously mentioned. Moreover it is not very hard to see that $\equiv$ may be equivalently defined as

$$\sigma \equiv \tau \quad \text{iff} \quad \sigma \oplus P_0 = \tau \oplus P_0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \sigma \bullet P_1 = \tau \bullet P_1$$

If we denote by $[\sigma]$ the equivalence class of $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, in view of Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we can see that

$$[\sigma] = [\sigma \bullet P_1] = [\sigma \oplus P_0] = [\rho_{p(\sigma)}]$$

Thus, we can consider the identification $(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)/\equiv) = (\rho_\lambda)_{\lambda \in [0,1]}$ and it may be easily proved that $\langle (\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)/\equiv), \oplus, \bullet, \neg, [P_0], [P_1] \rangle$ is a PMV -algebra, $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphic to $[0, 1]_{PMV}$. The $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphism is given by the assignment $[\rho_\lambda] \mapsto \lambda$. It is not very hard to see that $\equiv$ is a $(\oplus, \bullet, \neg)$ -congruence but not a $\sqrt{\cdot}$ -congruence.

Remark 2.5 It is important to remark that the notion of probability that seems to be alien to a IP -algebra, is indeed represented by terms of the algebra itself. More precisely, by $x \oplus P_0$ or $x \bullet P_1$.

Thus, any algebraic abstract frame of the IP -algebra must be a class $\mathcal{A}$ of algebras $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0 \rangle$, such that it is able not only to represent in an abstract form the properties of Lemma 2.4 but also is able to establish a $(\oplus, \bullet, \neg)$ -congruence $\equiv$ such that, $x \equiv y$ iff $x \oplus 0 = y \oplus 0$ iff $x \bullet 1 = y \bullet 1$ satisfying that $\langle A/\equiv, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a PMV -algebra.

On the other hand, a logical calculus $\langle \text{Term}_{\mathcal{A}}, \models \rangle$ interpreted in these algebraic generalization of the IP -algebra will take into account the following commutative diagrams as a generalizations of the probabilistic models

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Term_{\mathcal{A}} & \xrightarrow{f} & A/\equiv \\
e \downarrow & \equiv \nearrow & \\
A & & p
\end{array}$$

where e is a $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ -homomorphism called *interpretation on A* , p is the natural $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ -homomorphism given by the $(\oplus, \bullet, \neg)$ -congruence $\equiv$ (i.e an algebraic representation of the probability assignment) and the composition $f = pe$ is called *valuation*. We will refer to these diagrams as *PMV-models* in $\mathcal{A}$.

In this paper we develop a logical system whose logical consequence $\models$ is based on the preservation of the probability value $p(\sigma) = 1$. More precisely, for each pair $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$:

$$\sigma \models \tau \text{ iff } p(\sigma) = 1 \implies p(\tau) = 1$$

Consequently, the generalization of the logical consequence $\models$ in the *PMV*-models becomes: $\alpha \models \beta$ iff $f(\alpha) = 1$ implies that $f(\beta) = 1$ where $\alpha, \beta \in Term_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Remark 2.6 The fact that the logical consequence of these systems is related to functions f factorized through the *PMV*-models, does not allow to use standard methods of algebrization [3] to study the algebraic completeness of a Hilbert-style calculus.

3 Quantum computational algebras

The first and more basic algebraic structure associated to the Poincaré system was introduced in [26] for the reduced system $\langle \oplus, \neg, P_0, P_1 \rangle$. This is the *quasi MV-algebra* or *qMV-algebra* for short. A *qMV-algebra* is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 1, 0, 0 \rangle$ satisfying the following equation:

- Q1. $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x \oplus y) \oplus z,$
- Q2. $\neg \neg x = x,$
- Q3. $x \oplus 1 = 1,$
- Q4. $\neg(\neg x \oplus y) \oplus y = \neg(\neg y \oplus x) \oplus x,$

$$\text{Q5. } \neg(x \oplus 0) = \neg x \oplus 0,$$

$$\text{Q6. } (x \oplus y) \oplus 0 = x \oplus y,$$

$$\text{Q7. } \neg 0 = 1.$$

From an intuitive point of view, a qMV -algebra can be seen as an MV -algebra which fails to satisfy the equation $x \oplus 0 = x$. We denote by $q\mathcal{MV}$ the variety of qMV -algebras. We define the binary operations $\odot, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow$ in the same way as we did for MV -algebras.

Lemma 3.1 ([26, Lemma 6]) *The following equations are satisfied in each qMV -algebra:*

1. $x \oplus y = y \oplus x,$
2. $x \oplus \neg x = 1,$
3. $x \odot \neg x = 0,$
4. $0 \oplus 0 = 0.$
5. $x \oplus 0 = x \wedge x,$
6. $x \wedge y = y \wedge x,$
7. $x \vee y = y \vee x,$

□

In [16], an abstract algebraic structure for the quantum gates system $\langle \oplus, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, P_0, \rho_{\frac{1}{2}}, P_1 \rangle$ was introduced. These algebras are known as *square root quasi MV -algebras* or *$\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebras* for short. A $\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebra is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0 \rangle$ such that:

$$\text{SQ1. } \langle A, \oplus, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle \text{ is a } qMV\text{-algebra,}$$

$$\text{SQ2. } \sqrt{\neg x} = \neg \sqrt{x},$$

$$\text{SQ3. } \sqrt{\sqrt{x}} = \neg x,$$

$$\text{SQ4. } \sqrt{x \oplus y} \oplus 0 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We denote by $\sqrt{q\mathcal{MV}}$ the variety of $\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebras. In what follows we will extend the structure of $\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebras considering an algebraic framework for the *IAND* gate.

Definition 3.2 A $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0 \rangle$ satisfying the following:

1. $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a $\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebra,
2. $x \bullet y = y \bullet x$,
3. $x \bullet (y \bullet z) = (x \bullet y) \bullet z$,
4. $x \bullet 1 = x \oplus 0$,
5. $x \bullet y = (x \bullet y) \oplus 0$,
6. $x \bullet (y \odot \neg z) = (x \bullet y) \odot \neg(x \bullet z)$,
7. $\sqrt{x \bullet y} \oplus 0 = \frac{1}{2}$.

We denote by $\sqrt{qPMV}$ the variety of $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebras. It is not very hard to see that the *IP*-algebra is a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra.

Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra. Then we define a binary relations $\leq$ on A :

$$a \leq b \text{ iff } 1 = a \rightarrow b$$

$$a \equiv b \text{ iff } a \leq b \text{ and } b \leq a$$

It is clear that $\langle A, \leq \rangle$ is a preorder. One can also easily prove that $a \leq b$ iff $a \wedge b = a \oplus 0$ iff $a \vee b = b \oplus 0$. Moreover $a \equiv (a \oplus 0)$.

Proposition 3.3 *Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra and $a, b \in A$. Then we have:*

1. $a \bullet 0 = 0$,
2. If $a \bullet b = 1$ then $a \oplus 0 = b \oplus 0 = 1$,
3. If $a \leq b$ then $a \bullet x \leq b \bullet x$,
4. $x \bullet y \leq x$,
5. $x \bullet (y \oplus 0) = (x \bullet y) \oplus 0$,
6. $\frac{1}{2} = \neg \frac{1}{2}$,
7. $\frac{1}{2} \oplus 0 = \frac{1}{2}$,
8. $\sqrt{x \oplus y} \oplus \sqrt{z \oplus w} = 1$.

Proof: 1) $a \bullet 0 = a \bullet (0 \odot \neg 0) = (a \bullet 0) \odot \neg(a \bullet 0) = 0$. 2) Suppose that $a \bullet b = 1$. Then $\neg(a \oplus 0) = 1 \odot \neg(a \bullet 1) = (a \bullet b) \odot \neg(a \bullet 1) = a \bullet (b \odot \neg 1) = 0$. Thus $\neg(a \oplus 0) = 0$, hence $a \oplus 0 = 1$. 3) If $a \leq b$ then $1 = a \rightarrow b = \neg(a \odot \neg b)$ and $0 = a \odot \neg b$. Using item 1. we have that $0 = x \bullet 0 = x \bullet (a \odot \neg b) = (x \bullet a) \odot \neg(x \bullet b)$. Thus, $1 = \neg((x \bullet a) \odot \neg(x \bullet b)) = (x \bullet a) \rightarrow (x \bullet b)$ resulting $(x \bullet a) \leq (x \bullet b)$. 4) Since $x \leq 1$ by item 3. we have that $x \bullet y \leq x \bullet 1 = x \oplus 0 \leq x$. 5) $x \bullet (y \oplus 0) = x \bullet (y \bullet 1) = (x \bullet y) \bullet 1 = (x \bullet y) \oplus 0$. Items 6., 7. and 8. can be easily proved. $\square$

Definition 3.4 Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra. An element $a \in A$ is *regular* iff $a \oplus 0 = a$. We denote by $R(A)$ the set of regular elements.

Proposition 3.5 Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra. Then we have:

1. $\langle R(A), \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a *PMV-algebra*.
2. $\equiv$ is a $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg \rangle$ -congruence on A and $\langle A/\equiv, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, [0], [\frac{1}{2}], [1] \rangle$ is a *PMV-algebra*.
3. $A/\equiv$ is *PMV-isomorphic* to $R(A)$. This isomorphism is given by the assignment $[x] \mapsto x \oplus 0$.

Proof: 1) From [26, Lemma 9] $\langle R(A), \oplus, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ is an *MV-algebra*. Using Proposition 3.3-5, the operation $\bullet$ is closed in $R(A)$. Now from the axioms of the $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebras, $\langle R(A), \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ results a *PMV-algebra*.

2) It is easy to see that $\equiv$ is a $\langle \oplus, \neg \rangle$ -congruence. For technical details see [26]. From Proposition 3.3-3, $\equiv$ is compatible with $\bullet$. For the second part it is clear that we only need to see that the class $[1]$ is the identity in $\langle A/\equiv, \bullet, [1] \rangle$. In fact, $[x] \bullet [1] = [x \bullet 1] = [x \oplus 0] = [x]$.

3) Since $[x] = [x \oplus 0]$ for each $x \in A$, then φ is injective. If $x \in \text{Reg}(A)$ then $x = x \oplus 0$. Therefore $\varphi([x]) = x \oplus 0 = x$ and φ is surjective. Using Proposition 3.3-5 we have that $\varphi([x] \bullet [y]) = \varphi([x \bullet y]) = (x \bullet y) \oplus 0 = (x \oplus 0) \bullet (y \oplus 0) = \varphi([x]) \bullet \varphi([y])$. In the same way we can prove that $\varphi([x] \oplus [y]) = \varphi([x]) \oplus \varphi([y])$. By axiom Q5 $\varphi(\neg[x]) = \neg\varphi([x])$ and $\varphi([c]) = c$ for $c = 0, 1, \frac{1}{2}$ since they are regular elements in A . Thus $[x] \mapsto x \oplus 0$ is a *PMV-isomorphism*. $\square$

Remark 3.6 From Proposition 3.5 we can see that the natural $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg \rangle$ -homomorphism $A \rightarrow A/\equiv$ (equivalently represented as $A \rightarrow \text{Reg}(A)$ such that $x \mapsto x \oplus 0$) is an abstract version of the notion of probability in the *PMV-model* as the remark 2.5 and the paragraph below it claim.

Proposition 3.7 *Let $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ be a PMV-algebra such that $\neg \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$. Consider the set $S_A = A \times A$ with the following operations:*

$$\begin{aligned} (a, b) \oplus (c, d) &:= (a \oplus c, \frac{1}{2}), & 0 &:= (0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ (a, b) \bullet (c, d) &:= (a \bullet c, \frac{1}{2}), & 1 &:= (1, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \neg(a, b) &:= (\neg a, \neg b), & \frac{1}{2} &:= (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \sqrt{(a, b)} &:= (b, \neg a). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\langle S_A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra, and for each pair of elements $(a, b), (c, d)$ in S_A , $(a, b) \leq (c, d)$ iff $a \leq c$ in A .

Proof: It is not very hard to see that the reduct $\langle A \times A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a $\sqrt{qMV}$ -algebra. We only have to prove that S_A satisfies axioms 6 and 7 of $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebras.

Ax 6) $x \bullet (y \odot \neg z) = (x \bullet y) \odot \neg(x \bullet z)$. In fact, $(a, b) \bullet ((c, d) \odot \neg(z, w)) = (a, b) \bullet ((c, d) \odot (\neg z, \neg w)) = (a \bullet (c \odot \neg z), \frac{1}{2}) = ((a \bullet c) \odot \neg(a \bullet z), \frac{1}{2})$. On the other hand $((a, b) \bullet (c, d)) \odot \neg((a, b) \bullet (z, w)) = (a \bullet c, \frac{1}{2}) \odot (\neg(a \bullet z), \frac{1}{2}) = ((a \bullet c) \odot \neg(a \bullet z), \frac{1}{2})$.

Ax 7) $\sqrt{x \bullet y} \oplus 0 = \frac{1}{2}$. In fact: $\sqrt{(a, b) \bullet (c, d)} \oplus (0, \frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{(a \bullet c, \frac{1}{2})} \oplus (0, \frac{1}{2}) = (\frac{1}{2}, \neg(a \bullet c)) \oplus (0, \frac{1}{2}) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Hence S_A is a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra. Therefore we have that $(a, b) \leq (c, d)$ iff $(1, \frac{1}{2}) = (a, b) \rightarrow (c, d) = (\neg a \oplus b, \frac{1}{2})$ iff $a \leq b$ in A . $\square$

We denote by $\mathcal{S}^\square$ the class of algebras S_A built in Proposition 3.7 where A is a PMV-chain.

Proposition 3.8 *Let S_A be a $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra from the PMV-chain A . Then $R(S_A)$ is $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphic to A .*

Proof: If we consider $S_A \oplus 0 = \{(x, y) \oplus (0, \frac{1}{2}) : (x, y) \in A \times A\}$ then we have that $S_A \oplus 0 = \{(x, \frac{1}{2}) : x \in A\}$. Therefore, $S_A \oplus 0$ is $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphic to A . Using Proposition 3.5 we have that $R(S_A)$ is $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphic to A . $\square$

Proposition 3.9 *Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra and $t = t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -term.*

1. If t contains a subterm of the form $s_1 \oplus s_2$ then, for each $\bar{a} \in A^n$, $t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0 = 1$ implies that $t^A[\bar{a}] = 1$.
2. If A is a sub algebra of a $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra and $A \models t = 1$ then there exists a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -term t' such that $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}} \models t = t' \oplus 0$.

Proof: 1) Induction on the complexity of t . Since t contains at least an occurrence of $\oplus$, it cannot be an atomic term. Its minimum possible complexity is therefore represented by the case $t = s_1 \oplus s_2$ where each s_i is either a variable or constant, and our claim trivially follows from Axiom Q6. Now let our claim hold whenever the complexity of a term is less than n , and let t have complexity n . If $t^A[\bar{a}] \in \text{Reg}(A)$ our claim trivially follows. Suppose that $t^A[\bar{a}] \notin \text{Reg}(A)$. Then $t \neq s_1 \oplus s_2$ and $t \neq s_1 \bullet s_2$. By SQ3 we have to consider the case $t = \sqrt{s}$. There are two possible subcases. a) If $s = s_1 \star s_2$ such that $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ then $t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0 = 1$ implies that $1 = \sqrt{(s_1^A \star s_2^A)[\bar{a}] \oplus 0} = \frac{1}{2}$. In this case $0 = 1$ and A is a trivial algebra.

b) $s = \sqrt{s_1}$. Then $t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0 = 1$ implies that $1 = \sqrt{\sqrt{s_1^A[\bar{a}]} \oplus 0} = \neg s_1^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0$.

Since complexity of $\neg s_1$ is $n-1$ we have that $1 = \neg s_1^A[\bar{a}] = \sqrt{\sqrt{s_1^A[\bar{a}]}} = t^A[\bar{a}]$.

2) Induction on the complexity of t again. If t is atomic then $t = 1$. Now let our claim hold whenever the complexity of a term is less than n , and let t have complexity n . If $t = t_1 \star t_2$ such that $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ we can consider $t' = t$. Suppose that $t = \sqrt{s}$. In this case $A \models t = 1$ iff for any vector $\bar{a}$ in A , $s^A[\bar{a}] = (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. It is clear that $s \neq s_1 \star s_2$ with $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ since $s_1 \star s_2$ has the form $(a, \frac{1}{2})$ in A . By SQ3 we have to suppose that $s = \sqrt{s_1}$. In this case $t = \sqrt{\sqrt{s_1}}$. Therefore $A \models t = 1$ implies that $A \models \neg s_1 = 1$. Since $\neg s_1$ has a complexity $n-1$, then there exists a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -term t' such that $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}} \models \neg s_1 = t' \oplus 0$. Thus $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}} \models t = t' \oplus 0$. □

4 The irreversible Poincaré structure

In this section we will introduce the algebraic framework for the Poincaré irreversible quantum computational system. In the precedent section we have seen that the $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -structure captures the basic properties of the IP -algebra $\langle \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2), \bullet, \oplus, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, P_0, \rho_{\frac{1}{2}}, P_1 \rangle$ but it is not able to express in an abstract form the relation between density operators $\sigma = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and $\sqrt{\sigma}$

given in Lemma 2.4-10. This section is devoted to motivate and construct a structure able to capture the mentioned items of Lemma 2.4.

4.1 Irreversible Poincaré structure in the plane

The relation between $\sigma = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and $\sqrt{\sigma}$ with respect to the probability values they may take depends on the relation between the components r_2, r_3 given in Lemma 2.4-8. This fact suggests the analysis of an abstraction of the IP -algebra restricted to the $Y - Z$ plane.

Lemma 4.1 $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z} = \{\sigma = (0, r_2, r_3) : \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)\}$ is a sub universe of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ resulting a sub $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra of $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Moreover for each $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -term t

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z} \models t = 1 \text{ iff } \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2) \models t = 1$$

Proof: By definition of $\oplus$ and $\bullet$ it is clear that both are closed operations in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$. By Lemma 2.4-8, $\neg$ and $\sqrt{}$ are also closed in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$.

Claim. For each $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ -valuation $v : Term \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ there exists a $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$ -valuation $v' : Term \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ such that $v(t) \oplus P_0 = v'(t) \oplus P_0$. For the constant terms, v and v' must coincide. If t is a variable such that $v(t) = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$, we define $v'(t) = (0, r_2, r_3)$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3 $v(t) \oplus P_0 = \rho_{\frac{1-r_3}{2}} = v'(t) \oplus P_0$. In the usual way we can extend v' to the set $Term$. Now we use induction. If t is $t_1 \star t_2$ such that $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$, taking into account Proposition 3.3-5, $v'(t) \oplus P_0 = v'(t_1 \star t_2) \oplus P_0 = (v'(t_1) \oplus P_0) \star (v'(t_2) \oplus P_0) = (v(t_1) \oplus P_0) \star (v(t_2) \oplus P_0) = v(t_1 \star t_2) \oplus P_0 = v(t) \oplus P_0$. If t is $\neg s$, it follows from axiom Q5. If t is $\sqrt{s}$, we must consider three cases:

Case 1: s is a variable such that $v(s) = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$. By Lemma 2.4-8 $v(t) \oplus P_0 = \sqrt{v(s)} \oplus P_0 = (r_1, -r_3, r_2) \oplus P_0 = \rho_{\frac{1-r_2}{2}} = (0, -r_3, r_2) \oplus P_0 = \sqrt{v'(s)} \oplus P_0 = v'(t) \oplus P_0$.

Case 2: s is $s_1 \star s_2$. By Lemma 2.4-9, $v(t) \oplus P_0 = \sqrt{v(s_1 \star s_2)} \oplus P_0 = \rho_{p(\sqrt{v(s_1 \star s_2)})} = \rho_{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{v'(s_1 \star s_2)} \oplus P_0 = v'(t) \oplus P_0$

Case 3: s is $\neg s_1$ or $\sqrt{s_1}$ it is already included in the previous cases in view of Lemma 2.4-6 and 7. Thus, $v(t) \oplus P_0 = v'(t) \oplus P_0$ as is required.

Assume that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z} \models t = 1$. Let $v : Term \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be a valuation. By the claim, there exists a valuation $v' : Term \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$ such that

$v'(t) \oplus P_0 = v(t) \oplus P_0$ and clearly $v'(t) = P_1 = (0, 0, -1)$. Hence $P_1 = v(t) \oplus P_0 = \rho_{p(v(t))} = (0, 0, -1)$ iff $v(t) = (0, 0, -1)$. $\square$

Let $S_{[0,1]}$ be the $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra from $[0, 1]_{PMV}$. If we consider the set

$$D_{[0,1]} = \{(x, y) \in S_{[0,1]} : (x - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (y - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\}$$

it is not very hard to see that $D_{[0,1]}$ is a sub universe of $S_{[0,1]}$. Thus $\langle D_{[0,1]}, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, \sqrt{\cdot}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a sub $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra of $S_{[0,1]}$. In [26] is proved that the reduct $\langle D_{[0,1]}, \oplus, \neg, 0, 1 \rangle$ characterize the equational theory of the qMV .

Lemma 4.2 *Let $(x, y) \in S_{[0,1]}$. Then we have:*

1. $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{y}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ iff $(x, y) \in D_{[0,1]}$,
2. $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8} \leq \frac{3}{8} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$.
3. $\varphi : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z} \rightarrow D_{[0,1]}$ such that $\varphi(y, z) = (\frac{1-z}{2}, \frac{1-y}{2})$ is a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -isomorphism.

Proof: 1) We first note that that $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{y}{4} = \frac{x}{4} + \frac{y}{4}$. Consider the function $\frac{x}{4} + \frac{y}{4}$ subject to the constraint $(x - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (y - \frac{1}{2})^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Using Lagrange multipliers, we obtain the following equation system

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f &= \nabla(\frac{x}{4} + \frac{y}{4}) = \lambda \nabla[(x - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (y - \frac{1}{2})^2 - 1] \\ (x - 1/2)^2 + (y - 1/2)^2 &= 1/4 \end{aligned}$$

It is equivalent to the system

$$\{ 2\lambda(x - \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad 2\lambda(y - \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad (x - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (y - \frac{1}{2})^2 = \frac{1}{4} \}$$

and it is not very hard to see that $x = y = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$ is a solution of this system, giving a maximum of $\frac{x}{4} + \frac{y}{4}$ in the mentioned restriction. Thus $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{y}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. To see the converse, assume that $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{y}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. Let $x = \frac{1}{2} + r \cos \theta$ and $y = \frac{1}{2} + r \sin \theta$, therefore from $\frac{1}{4}(\frac{1}{2} + r \cos \theta) + \frac{1}{4}(\frac{1}{2} + r \sin \theta) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ we have that $r(\cos \theta + \sin \theta) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. But the maximum of $(\cos \theta + \sin \theta)$ is given when

$\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$. In this case $r \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ resulting $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$

2) Immediate.

3) Let $\sigma = (0, b, c) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$. Then $\varphi(\sigma) = (\frac{1-c}{2}, \frac{1-b}{2})$ and $(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (\frac{1-b}{2} - \frac{1}{2})^2 = \frac{1}{4}(c^2 + b^2) \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Thus the image of φ is contained in $D_{[0,1]}$. It is clear that φ is injective. Let $(a, b) \in D_{[0,1]}$. If we consider $\sigma = (0, 1-2b, 1-2a)$ then $(1-2b)^2 + (1-2a)^2 = 4(\frac{1}{2}-a)^2 + 4(\frac{1}{2}-b)^2 \leq 1$. Hence $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2)_{y,z}$, $\varphi(\sigma) = (a, b)$ and φ is a surjective map. Now we prove that φ is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism. Let $\sigma = (0, r_2, r_3)$ and $\tau = (0, s_2, s_3)$. Using Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 2.4 we have that:

- Let $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. $\varphi(\sigma \star \tau) = \varphi(\rho_{p(\sigma) \star p(\tau)}) = \varphi(0, 0, 1 - 2(p(\sigma) \star p(\tau))) = (p(\sigma) \star p(\tau), \frac{1}{2}) = (\frac{1-r_3}{2}, \frac{1-r_2}{2}) \star (\frac{1-s_3}{2}, \frac{1-s_2}{2}) = \varphi(\sigma) \star \varphi(\tau)$.
- $\varphi(\sqrt{\sigma}) = \varphi(0, -r_3, r_2) = (\frac{1-r_2}{2}, \frac{1+r_3}{2}) = (\frac{1-r_2}{2}, 1 - \frac{1-r_3}{2}) = \sqrt{(\frac{1-r_3}{2}, \frac{1-r_2}{2})} = \sqrt{\varphi(\sigma)}$.
- $\varphi(P_1) = \varphi(0, 0, -1) = (1, \frac{1}{2})$, $\varphi(P_0) = \varphi(0, 0, 1) = (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\varphi(\rho_{\frac{1}{2}}) = \varphi(0, 0, 0) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Thus φ is $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -isomorphism. □

In view of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 we can establish the following proposition:

Theorem 4.3 *For each $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -term t we have that*

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}^2) \models t = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad D_{[0,1]} \models t = 1$$

□

By Lemma 4.2, $D_{[0,1]}$ satisfies the relation between x and $\sqrt{x}$ claimed by Lemma 2.4 (items 10 and 11). Since for our logical system only $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -equations of the form $t = 1$ are need, in view of Theorem 4.3, $D_{[0,1]}$ is a more appropriate standard frame than $S_{[0,1]}$ for the algebra of quantum gates.

4.2 PMV -algebras with fix point of the negation

To obtain an algebraic structure able to generalize $D_{[0,1]}$ it is necessary to represent the inequality $\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{\sqrt{x}}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ given in Lemma 4.2. Taking into account Lemma 1.3, we have that:

$$\frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{\sqrt{x}}{4} \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}} \iff \forall s \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2}) \text{ s.t. } s \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}, \quad \frac{x}{4} \oplus \frac{\sqrt{x}}{4} \leq s$$

In terms of the language of $\sqrt{qPMV}$, the second part of the above equivalence can be expressed through the following set of equations:

$$\{1 = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s : s \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2}) \text{ and } s \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}$$

To represent this set of equations we need consider a subclass of the $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebras such that their regular elements have an isomorphic copy of $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. In this subsection we give an equational theory for the class PMV -algebras containing an isomorphic copy of $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$ as sub PMV -algebra.

It is well known that a PMV -algebra has at most a fix point of the negation [22, Lemma 2.10]. In $[0,1]_{PMV}$ we have that $\neg \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$. In the type of algebras $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$,

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \text{ design } \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } n = 1 \\ (\frac{1}{2^{n-1}}) \bullet \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } n > 1 \end{cases}$$

and for each $a \in N$ such that $0 \leq a \leq 2^n$,

$$\frac{a}{2^n} = \bigoplus_a \frac{1}{2^n} \text{ design } \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a = 0 \\ (\bigoplus_{a-1} \frac{1}{2^n}) \oplus \frac{1}{2^n}, & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq 2^n \end{cases}$$

In that follows $\frac{1}{4}$ design the term $\frac{1}{2^2}$ and $\frac{1}{8}$ design the term $\frac{1}{2^3}$.

Definition 4.4 A $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0 \rangle$ satisfying the following:

- 1 $\langle A, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a PMV -algebra,
- 2 $\neg \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$3 \quad \frac{a}{2^n} \odot \frac{b}{2^m} = \frac{\max\{0, a+b2^{n-m}-2^n\}}{2^n} \text{ with } n \geq m,$$

$$4 \quad \frac{a}{2^n} \bullet \frac{b}{2^m} = \frac{ab}{2^{n+m}},$$

$$5 \quad \neg \frac{a}{2^n} = \frac{2^n - a}{2^n}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ the variety of $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebras. It is clear that $[0, 1]_{PMV}$ is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. If A is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra then $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ design the sub algebra of A generated by $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. By Axiom 3,4,5 and induction in the complexity of terms we can establish the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5 *Let A be a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. Then for each $x \in G_A(\frac{1}{2})$, $x = \frac{a}{2^n}$ for some $a \leq 2^n$. $\square$*

Theorem 4.6 *Let A be a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. Then there exists an unique $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -isomorphisms from $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ onto $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$.*

Proof: We first prove that $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ is a simple algebra. By Proposition 1.1 and Proposition 1.4-2 we have to see that for each $x \neq 1$ in $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$, x is $\odot$ -nilpotent. Suppose that $x = \frac{a}{2^n}$. By induction, we can see that $\odot_k \frac{a}{2^n} = \frac{\max\{0, ka - (k-1)2^n\}}{2^n}$. Thus for $k \geq \frac{2^n}{2^n - a}$ result $\odot_k \frac{a}{2^n} = 0$ and then x is $\odot$ -nilpotent. Hence $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ is simple. By Proposition 1.4-3 if we consider the following $\mathcal{PMV}$ -homomorphism $\mathbf{2} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{PMV}$ and $\mathbf{2} \rightarrow G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ there exists a $\mathcal{PMV}$ -homomorphism $f : G_A(\frac{1}{2}) \rightarrow [0, 1]_{PMV}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{2} & \longrightarrow & [0, 1]_{PMV} \\ \downarrow & \equiv & \nearrow f \\ G_A(\frac{1}{2}) & & \end{array}$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}$ is the unique fix point of the negation in $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ it is clear that $f(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus f is a $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -homomorphism. Since $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ is simple then f is injective. It is clear that $Imag(f) \subseteq G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. We prove that $Imag(f) = G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. Let $x \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. Then there exists a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -term t such that $x = t^{G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})}[0, \frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Since f is a $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -homomorphism then we have $f(t^{G_A(\frac{1}{2})}[0, \frac{1}{2}, 1]) = t^{G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})}[f(0), f(\frac{1}{2}), f(1)] = t^{G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})}[0, \frac{1}{2}, 1] = x$

and $\text{Imag}(f) = G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. Hence f is a $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -isomorphism from $G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ onto $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. If f' is other $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -isomorphisms then f and f' coincides over $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. Therefor, by induction on the complexity of terms it follows that $f = f'$. $\square$

Remark 4.7 From the last theorem whenever A is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra, we will have the following identification $G_A(\frac{1}{2}) = G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. Thus each $s \in G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ is seen as a unique element of $G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$.

4.3 Irreversible Poincaré algebras

In view of Theorem 4.6 now we can introduce a substructure of $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ that allows to capture the relation between x and $\sqrt{x}$ given in Lemma 2.4-10.

Definition 4.8 An *irreversible Poincaré algebra* is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -algebra satisfying the following axioms:

P1 $R(A)$ is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra,

P2 $1 = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s$ where $s \in G_{R(A)}(\frac{1}{2})$ and $s \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$.

It is clear that the Poincaré structure conforms a variety since Axiom P1 is satisfied by adding Ax 3, Ax 4 and Ax 5 of $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ to $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{IP}$ the subvariety of $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ conformed by the irreversible Poincaré algebras.

Remark 4.9 In view of Lemma 4.2 it is not hard to see that $D_{[0,1]}$ is a $\mathcal{IP}$ -algebra, being the “standard model” of $\mathcal{IP}$. Unfortunately we cannot give a completeness theorem for the $\mathcal{IP}$ -equations of the form $t = 1$ with respect to $D_{[0,1]}$. In fact, the open problem of axiomatization of all identities in the language of $\mathcal{PMV}$ which are valid in the PMV -algebra arising from the real interval $[0, 1]$ (see [27, 23]) will appear in $\mathcal{IP}$. In view of this, we delineate a generalization of the $D_{[0,1]}$ algebra, whose role is analogous to the PMV -chains with respect to the equational theory of $\mathcal{PMV}$.

Let S_A be a $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra from the $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -chain A . In view of Remark 4.7, for $(a, b) \in S_A$ the expression $(a, b) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ should be understood as $(a, b) \leq (s, \frac{1}{2})$ for all $s \in G_A(\frac{1}{2})$ such that $s \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ (or equivalent $a \leq s$ in A for all $s \in G_A(\frac{1}{2})$). We consider the following partition in S_A :

Quadrant I: $A^\perp = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : x \geq \frac{1}{2}, y \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$

$$Q1 = \{(x, y) \in A^\perp : (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y)\} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}$$

Quadrant 2: $A^\lrcorner = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : x \leq \frac{1}{2}, y \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$

$$Q2 = \{(x, y) \in A^\lrcorner : (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y)\} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}$$

Quadrant 3: $A^\neg = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : x \leq \frac{1}{2}, y \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$

$$Q3 = \{(x, y) \in A^\neg : (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y)\} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}$$

Quadrant 4: $A^\neg = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : x \geq \frac{1}{2}, y \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$

$$Q4 = \{(x, y) \in A^\neg : (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y)\} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}$$

Then we define

$$D_A = Q1 \cup Q2 \cup Q3 \cup Q4$$

Since A is a chain it is clear that $A^2 = A^\perp \cup A^\lrcorner \cup A^\neg \cup A^\neg$.

Proposition 4.10 *Let S_A be a $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra from the $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -chain A . Then D_A is a sub-universe of S_A and*

$$\langle D_A, \oplus, \bullet, \sqrt{}, (0, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), (1, \frac{1}{2}) \rangle$$

is the largest irreversible Poincaré algebra contained in S_A . Moreover $Reg(D_A)$ is PMV -isomorphic to A .

Proof: We first note that $(x, \frac{1}{2}) \in D_A$ for each $x \in A$ since $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \frac{1}{2}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8} = \frac{3}{8} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. Thus if (x_1, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) are in D_A and $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ then $(x_1, y_1) \star (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 \star x_2, \frac{1}{2}) \in D_A$. Hence D_A is closed by $\oplus$ and $\bullet$. D_A is closed by $\neg$. In fact:

If $(x, y) \in Q1$ then $\neg(x, y) = (\neg x, \neg y) \in Q3$ since

$$(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg x)) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg y)) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$$

If $(x, y) \in Q2$ then $\neg(x, y) = (\neg x, \neg y) \in Q4$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg y)) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

If $(x, y) \in Q3$ then $\neg(x, y) = (\neg x, \neg y) \in Q1$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

If $(x, y) \in Q4$ then $\neg(x, y) = (\neg x, \neg y) \in Q2$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg x)) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

D_A is closed by $\sqrt{\cdot}$. In fact:

If $(x, y) \in Q1$ then $\sqrt{(x, y)} = (y, \neg x) \in Q4$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg x)) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

If $(x, y) \in Q2$ then $\sqrt{(x, y)} = (y, \neg x) \in Q1$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

If $(x, y) \in Q3$ then $\sqrt{(x, y)} = (y, \neg x) \in Q2$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet (\neg x)) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

If $(x, y) \in Q4$ then $\sqrt{(x, y)} = (y, \neg x) \in Q3$ since
 $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\neg x)) = (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}.$

Thus D_A is a subalgebra of S_A . We will see that D_A is an irreversible Poincaré algebra. If $(x, y) \in D_A$ then $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet (x, y)) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{(x, y)}) = ((\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}) \bullet (x, y)) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}) \bullet (y, \neg x)) = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y), \frac{1}{2})$. Therefore we need to prove that $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ in the PMV -algebra A . In fact: if $(x, y) \in Q1$ then the inequality is valid. If $(x, y) \in Q2$ then $x \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \neg x$. Therefore $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. If $(x, y) \in Q3$ then $x \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \neg x$ and $y \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \neg y$. Therefore $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. If $(x, y) \in Q4$ then $y \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \neg y$. Therefore $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \leq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$.

Now we prove that D_A is the largest irreversible Poincaré algebra contained in S_A . Let B be an irreversible Poincaré algebra contained

in S_A and let $(x, y) \in B$.

1. If $x \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then $(x, y) \in Q1$.
2. Suppose that $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\sqrt{(x, y)} = (y, \neg x) \in B$ then $\frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}} \geq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{(x, y)}) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\sqrt{(x, y)}}) = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x), \frac{1}{2})$. In this case $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ and $(x, y) \in Q2$.
3. Suppose that $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\neg(x, y) = (\neg x, \neg y) \in B$ then $\frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}} \geq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(x, y)) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\neg(x, y)}) = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y), \frac{1}{2})$. In this case $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. Thus $(x, y) \in Q3$.
4. Suppose that $x \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\neg\sqrt{(x, y)} = (\neg y, x) \in B$ then $\frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}} \geq (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\sqrt{(x, y)}) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\neg\sqrt{(x, y)}}) = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x), \frac{1}{2})$. In this case $(\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg y) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. Thus $(x, y) \in Q4$.

Thus $(x, y) \in D_A$ and B is a Poincaré sub algebra of D_A . With the same argument used in Proposition 3.8 we can prove that $Reg(D_A)$ is $\mathcal{PMV}$ -isomorphic to A .

□

We denote by $\mathcal{S}^\circ$ the class of algebras D_A given in Proposition 4.10 where A is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -chain. For the sake of simplicity in the notation, in the next theorem we will use the following convention: $\mathcal{S}$ may be either $\mathcal{S}^\square$ or $\mathcal{S}^\circ$ and we define the class of algebras $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{qPMV}, & \text{if } \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^\square \\ \mathcal{IP}, & \text{if } \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^\circ \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.11 *For each $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -term t we have that*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \models t = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{S} \models t = 1$$

Proof: Let A be a $\sqrt{qPMV}$ -algebra. We consider the PMV -algebra $Reg(A)$ of all regular elements. By Proposition 1.4 we can consider a sub-direct representation $\beta : Reg(A) \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ such that $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of PMV -chains. If $x \in Reg(A)$ we write $\beta(x) = (x_i)_{i \in I}$. Let p_j the j -th projection $p_j : \prod_{i \in I} A_i \rightarrow A_j$. By Proposition 3.7, we consider the $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra

$S_{Reg(A)}$ and for each PMV -chain A_i we consider the $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra S_{A_i} and D_{A_i} , the $\mathcal{S}^\circ$ sub algebra of S_{A_i} . Define the function

$$f : A \rightarrow S_{Reg(A)} \quad s.t. \quad x \mapsto (x \oplus 0, \sqrt{x} \oplus 0)$$

We need to prove that f is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism.

- Let $a \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. In this case $a \in Reg(A)$ and $\sqrt{a} \oplus 0 = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore $f(a) = (a \oplus 0, \sqrt{a} \oplus 0) = (a, \frac{1}{2})$.
- Let $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. $f(x \star y) = ((x \star y) \oplus 0, \sqrt{x \star y} \oplus 0) = ((x \star y) \oplus 0, \frac{1}{2}) = (x \oplus 0, \sqrt{x} \oplus 0) \star (y \oplus 0, \sqrt{y} \oplus 0) = f(x) \star f(y)$.
- $f(\sqrt{x}) = (\sqrt{x} \oplus 0, \sqrt{\sqrt{x} \oplus 0}) = (\sqrt{x} \oplus 0, \neg(x \oplus 0)) = \sqrt{(x \oplus 0, \sqrt{x} \oplus 0)} = \sqrt{f(x)}$. Consequently $f(\neg x) = \neg f(x)$ in view of Axiom SQ3.

Thus f is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism. For each $i \in I$ we consider the function

$$\beta_i : S_{Reg(A)} \rightarrow S_{A_i} \quad s.t. \quad (x, y) \mapsto (p_i \beta(x), p_i \beta(y))_{i \in I}$$

We will prove that β_i is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism for each $i \in I$. Let $(x, y), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in S_{Reg(A)}$

- The cases $(0, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), (1, \frac{1}{2})$ are immediate.
- Let $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. $\beta_i((x_1, y_1) \star (x_2, y_2)) = \beta_i(x_1 \star x_2, \frac{1}{2}) = (x_{1i} \star x_{2i}, \frac{1}{2_i}) = (x_{1i}, y_{1i}) \star (x_{2i}, y_{2i}) = \beta_i((x_1, y_1)) \star \beta_i((x_2, y_2))$.
- $\beta_i(\sqrt{(x, y)}) = \beta_i((y, \neg x)) = (y_i, \neg x_i) = \sqrt{(x_i, y_i)} = \sqrt{\beta_i(x, y)}$. Consequently $f(\neg x) = \neg f(x)$ in view of Axiom SQ3.

Thus β_i is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism for each $i \in I$. Now we prove the theorem.

$\implies$) Immediate

$\impliedby$) Assume that $\mathcal{S} \models t = 1$. By Proposition 3.9 we can identify t with $t \oplus 0$. Suppose that there exists $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\bar{a} \in A^n$ such that $t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0 \neq 1$. Then $f(t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0) = ((t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0) \oplus 0, \sqrt{t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0} \oplus 0) = (t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0, \frac{1}{2}) \neq (1, \frac{1}{2})$ in $S_{Reg(A)}$. It is clear that $t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0 \in Reg(A)$. By the subdirect representation of the PMV -algebra $Reg(A)$, there exists A_i such that $(t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0)_i \neq 1_i$ in A_i . Therefore $((t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0)_i, \frac{1}{2_i}) \neq (1_i, \frac{1}{2_i})$ in S_{A_i} . Since $\beta_i f$ is a $\sqrt{q\mathcal{PMV}}$ -homomorphism, we have that $t^{S_{A_i}}[\beta_i f(\bar{a})] = ((t^A[\bar{a}] \oplus 0)_i, \frac{1}{2_i}) \neq (1_i, \frac{1}{2_i})$ and

this is a contradiction in the case $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^\square$. If $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^\circ$ then $A \in \mathcal{IP}$. By Proposition 4.10, $\beta_i f(A)$ is a sub algebra of D_{A_i} . Therefore $t^{D_{A_i}}[\beta_i f(\bar{a})] = t^{S_{A_i}}[\beta_i f(\bar{a})] \neq (1_i, \frac{1}{2_i})$ and this is also a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \models t = 1$. $\square$

5 Hilbert-style calculus for $\mathcal{IP}$

In this section we build a Hilbert-style calculus founded on the irreversible Poincaré structure taking into account PMV -models whose logical consequence is based on the preservation of the probability value equal to 1.

5.1 Syntax and semantic

Consider the absolutely free algebra $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ built from the set of variables $V = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ as underling language for the calculus. In addition we introduce by definition the connective $\iff$ as follows:

$$\alpha \iff \beta \text{ for } (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \odot (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$$

Let A be an algebra in $\mathcal{IP}$ and $p : A \rightarrow A/\equiv$ be the natural $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ -homomorphism. Then *interpretations* of the language $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ in A is any $\mathcal{IP}$ -homomorphism $e : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow A$, and the *valuation* associated to e is the composition $e_p = pe$. Therefore the PMV -models in $\mathcal{IP}$ are established and for each $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$, $e_p(\alpha) = p(e(\alpha))$ represent in this framework the “probability value” of the term α .

Proposition 5.1 *Let D_A be the $\mathcal{S}^\circ$ -algebra associated to the $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -chain A . If e, e' are two interpretations over D_A such that for each atomic term α , $e_p(\alpha) = e'_p(\alpha)$ and $e_p(\sqrt{\alpha}) = e'_p(\sqrt{\alpha})$ then we have that $e = e'$.*

Proof: Let α be an atomic term. Suppose that $e(\alpha) = (x, y)$ and $e'(\alpha) = (x', y')$. Using Proposition 3.8 we can identify p with the x -projection. Thus $e_p(\alpha) = p(x, y) = x$ and $e'_p(\alpha) = p(x', y') = x'$, $e_p(\sqrt{\alpha}) = p(y, \neg x) = y$ and $e'_p(\sqrt{\alpha}) = p(y', \neg x') = y'$. Using the hypothesis we have that $x = x'$ and $y = y'$. Finally by an inductive argument on the complexity of terms, it results that $e = e'$. $\square$

Definition 5.2 An $\mathcal{IP}$ -term α is a *tautology* iff for each interpretation e we have that $e_p(\alpha) = 1$

Let $Term(\frac{1}{2})$ be the sub-language (without variables) of $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ generated by $\langle \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$. For any interpretation $e : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow A$, it is clear that the restriction $e_p : Term(\frac{1}{2}) \rightarrow A/\equiv$ is a $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -homomorphism whose image is the sub algebra $G_{A/\equiv}(\frac{1}{2})$. By induction on the complexity of terms we can prove that if e, e' are two interpretations then, for each $s \in Term(\frac{1}{2})$, $e_p(s) = e'_p(s)$. Consequently by Remark 4.7 each element $s \in Term(\frac{1}{2})$ can be identified with a single number $\bar{s} \in G_{[0,1]}(\frac{1}{2})$. Taking into account this fact, we introduce the following axiomatic system:

Definition 5.3 The following terms are axioms of the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus:

Lukasiewicz axioms

$$W1 \quad \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$$

$$W2 \quad (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma))$$

$$W3 \quad (\neg \alpha \rightarrow \neg \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$$

$$W4 \quad ((\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\beta \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)$$

Constant axioms

$$C1 \quad 1$$

$$C2 \quad \neg 0 \iff 1$$

$$C3 \quad \neg \frac{1}{2} \iff \frac{1}{2}$$

$$C4 \quad \frac{a}{2^n} \odot \frac{b}{2^m} \iff \frac{\max\{0, a+b2^{n-m}-2^n\}}{2^n} \text{ with } n \geq m,$$

$$C5 \quad \frac{a}{2^n} \bullet \frac{b}{2^m} \iff \frac{ab}{2^{n+m}},$$

$$C6 \quad \neg \frac{a}{2^n} \iff \frac{2^n - a}{2^n}.$$

Product axioms

$$P1 \quad (\alpha \bullet \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \bullet \alpha)$$

$$P2 \quad (1 \bullet \alpha) \iff \alpha$$

$$P3 \quad (\alpha \bullet \beta) \rightarrow \beta$$

$$P4 \quad (\alpha \bullet \beta) \bullet \gamma \iff \alpha \bullet (\beta \bullet \gamma)$$

$$P5 \quad x \bullet (y \odot \neg z) \iff (x \bullet y) \odot \neg(x \bullet z)$$

Sqrt axioms

$$sQ1 \quad \sqrt{\sqrt{\alpha}} \iff \neg \alpha$$

$$sQ2 \quad \sqrt{\neg \alpha} \iff \neg \sqrt{\alpha}$$

$$sQ3 \quad \text{If } * \text{ is a binary operation } \sqrt{\alpha * \beta} \iff \frac{1}{2}$$

$$sQ4 \quad \sqrt{0} \iff \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \iff \sqrt{1} \iff \frac{1}{2}.$$

$$sQ5 \quad \{((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \alpha) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\alpha})) \rightarrow s : s \in Term(\frac{1}{2}), \bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}.$$

The unique deduction rule is *modus ponens* $\{\alpha, \alpha \rightarrow \beta\} \vdash \beta$ (MP).

A theory is any set $T \subseteq Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. A *proof* from T is a sequence of terms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that each member is either an axiom or a member of T or follows from preceding members of the sequence by modus ponens. $T \vdash \alpha$ means that α is provable in T , that is, α is the last term of a proof from T . Thus the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus is conformed by the pair $\langle Term_{\mathcal{IP}}, \vdash \rangle$. If $T = \emptyset$ we use the notation $\vdash \alpha$ and we said that α is a *theorem*. T is *inconsistent* if and only $T \vdash \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$; otherwise it is *consistent*. We note that axioms W1...W4, C1, C2 and MP conform the same propositional system as the infinite valued Łukasiewicz calculus [6, §4].

Lemma 5.4 *Let $\alpha, \beta \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ and T be a theory. Then the following items may be proved using only W1...W4, C1, C2, P1...P5 and MP.*

1. $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$
2. $T \vdash \alpha \odot \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad T \vdash \alpha \text{ and } T \vdash \beta,$
3. $T \vdash \alpha \iff \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad T \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta \text{ and } T \vdash \beta \rightarrow \alpha,$
4. $T \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta \text{ and } T \vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma \quad \text{then} \quad T \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \gamma,$
5. $\vdash \neg \neg \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$
6. $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\neg \beta \rightarrow \neg \alpha),$

7. $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\alpha \oplus \gamma) \rightarrow (\beta \oplus \gamma)),$
8. $\vdash ((\alpha \iff \beta) \odot (\beta \iff \gamma)) \rightarrow (\alpha \iff \gamma)$
9. $\vdash (\alpha \iff \beta) \rightarrow ((\alpha \rightarrow \gamma) \iff (\beta \rightarrow \gamma))$
10. $\vdash (\alpha \iff \beta) \rightarrow ((\gamma \rightarrow \alpha) \iff (\gamma \rightarrow \beta))$
11. $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \rightarrow (\gamma \bullet \beta))$

Proof: Items 1...10 are follows from the fact that they are theorems (or meta theorem) in the infinite valued Łukasiewicz calculus given in [20]. We prove item 11:

- (1) $\vdash \gamma \bullet (\alpha \odot \neg \beta) \rightarrow ((\alpha \odot \neg \beta))$ by Ax P3
- (2) $\vdash ((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta)) \rightarrow \gamma \bullet (\alpha \odot \neg \beta)$ by Ax P5
- (3) $\vdash ((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta)) \rightarrow (\alpha \odot \neg \beta)$ by 1,2, Ax W2
- (4) $\vdash (((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta)) \rightarrow (\alpha \odot \neg \beta)) \rightarrow (\neg(\alpha \odot \neg \beta) \rightarrow \neg((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta)))$
by Ax W3
- (5) $\vdash \neg(\alpha \odot \neg \beta) \rightarrow \neg((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta))$ by MP 3,4
- (6) $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \neg(\alpha \odot \neg \beta)$ by def $\odot$, item 1
- (7) $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \neg((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta))$ by 5,6 , Ax W2
- (8) $\vdash \neg((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \odot \neg(\gamma \bullet \beta)) \rightarrow ((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \rightarrow (\gamma \bullet \beta))$ by def $\odot$, item 1
- (9) $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\gamma \bullet \alpha) \rightarrow (\gamma \bullet \beta))$ by 7,8, Ax W2

□

An interpretation e is a *model of a theory* T if and only if $e_p(\alpha) = 1$ for each $\alpha \in T$. In this case we will use the notation $e_p(T) = 1$. We use $T \models \alpha$ in case that $e_p(\alpha) = 1$ whenever $e_p(T) = 1$.

Proposition 5.5 *Axioms of the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus are tautologies. Moreover if e is a model for the theory T and $T \vdash \alpha$ then, $e_p(\alpha) = 1$.*

Proof: The first part is trivial. The second assertion is easily verified from the fact that the modus ponens preserves valuations equal to 1. □

5.2 The $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment

In $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ consider the absolutely free algebra $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ generated by

$$\langle V \cup (\sqrt{x})_{x \in V}, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$$

(i.e. taking the family of terms $(\sqrt{x})_{x \in V}$ as atomic terms) together with the calculus given by the axioms W1 ... W4, C1 ... C6, P1 ... P5 and MP as inference rule. Proof in $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ are denoted by the symbol $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}$. Note that, for all purposes, the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment given by $\langle Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}, \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \rangle$ is a PMV -calculus. Hence, the results of Lemma 5.4 continue to be valid in the fragment. Let A be a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. Valuations of $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ in A are $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -homomorphism $v : Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}} \rightarrow A$ where $\sqrt{x}$ is tacked as a variable for each $x \in V$. A term $\alpha \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ is called $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -tautology if and only if for each valuation v , $v(\alpha) = 1$. Let T be a theory in $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$. Then T is said to be *complete* iff, for each pair of terms α, β in $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$, we have: $T \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ or $T \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta \rightarrow \alpha$.

Lemma 5.6 *Let T be a theory and α be a term, both in $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$. Suppose that T does not prove α in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment. Then there exists a consistent complete theory $T' \subseteq Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ such that, T' is complete, $T \subseteq T'$ and T' does not prove α in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment.*

Proof: See [20, Lemma 2.4.2]). □

Theorem 5.7 *Let T be a consistent theory in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment. For each term $\alpha \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ we consider the class*

$$[\alpha] = \{\beta \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}} : T \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha \iff \beta\}$$

Let $L_T = \{[\alpha] : \alpha \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}\}$. If we define the following operation in L_T :

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= [0] & \neg[\alpha] &= [\neg\alpha] \\
\frac{1}{2} &= [\frac{1}{2}] & [\alpha] * [\beta] &= [\alpha * \beta] \text{ for } * \in \{\oplus, \bullet\} \\
1 &= [1]
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\langle L_T, \oplus, \bullet, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ is a $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. Moreover if T is a complete theory then L_T is a totally order set.

Proof: We first must see that the operations are well defined on L_T . In the cases $\oplus, \neg, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$ we refer to [20, Lemma 2.3.12]. The case $\bullet$ follows from Lemma 5.4. By axioms W1 ... W4, C1 ... C5, P1 ... P5, it is not very hard to see that L_T is a PMV -algebra. If T is a complete theory, using the same argument as [20, Lemma 2.4.2], L_T is a totally ordered set. $\square$

We will refer to L_T as the *Lindenbaum algebra* associated to the theory $T \subseteq Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$.

5.3 Completeness of the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus

Definition 5.8 We define the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -translation $\alpha \xrightarrow{t} \alpha_t$ as the application $t : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
x &\xrightarrow{t} x \text{ and } \sqrt{x} \xrightarrow{t} \sqrt{x} \quad \text{for each } x \in V, \\
c &\xrightarrow{t} c \text{ and } \sqrt{c} \xrightarrow{t} \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for each } c \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}, \\
\neg\alpha &\xrightarrow{t} \neg(\alpha_t), \\
\sqrt{\neg\alpha} &\xrightarrow{t} (\neg\sqrt{\alpha})_t, \\
\sqrt{\sqrt{\alpha}} &\xrightarrow{t} (\neg\alpha)_t, \\
\sqrt{\alpha \star \beta} &\xrightarrow{t} \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for each binary connective } \star, \\
\alpha \star \beta &\xrightarrow{t} \alpha_t \star \beta_t \quad \text{for each binary connective } \star,
\end{aligned}$$

The $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -translation is a syntactic representation of the function p in the PMV -model. If T is a theory in $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ then, we define the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -translation over T as the set $T_t = \{\alpha_t : \alpha \in T\}$.

Proposition 5.9 *Let $\alpha \in \text{Term}_{\mathcal{IP}}$. Then we have:*

$$\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$$

Proof: We use induction on complexity of terms. Let α be an atomic term. By definition of $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -translation, Lemma 5.4-1 and axiom sQ4 of the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus it is clear that $\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$ and $\vdash \sqrt{\alpha} \iff (\sqrt{\alpha})_t$. Suppose that $\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$ and $\vdash \beta \iff \beta_t$.

- By Lemma 5.4-6 we have that $\vdash \neg \alpha \iff \neg \alpha_t$.
- Let $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. Then we have that:

- (1) $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \alpha_t$
- (2) $\vdash (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_t) \rightarrow ((\alpha \star \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha_t \star \beta))$ by Lemma 5.4, item 7 or 11
- (3) $\vdash (\alpha \star \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha_t \star \beta)$ MP 1-2
- (4) $\vdash \beta \rightarrow \beta_t$
- (5) $\vdash (\beta \rightarrow \beta_t) \rightarrow ((\alpha_t \star \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha_t \star \beta_t))$ by Lemma 5.4, item 7 or 11
- (6) $\vdash (\alpha_t \star \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha_t \star \beta_t)$ MP 4-5
- (7) $\vdash (\alpha \star \beta) \rightarrow (\alpha_t \star \beta_t)$ by Lemma 5.4-4

By the same argument we can prove that $\vdash (\alpha_t \star \beta_t) \rightarrow (\alpha \star \beta)$. Hence $\vdash (\alpha \star \beta) \iff (\alpha \star \beta)_t$.

- If α is $\sqrt{\gamma}$ then we must consider three cases:
 - i) γ is $\gamma_1 \star \gamma_2$ such that $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. Then $\alpha_t = (\sqrt{\gamma})_t = (\sqrt{\gamma_1 \star \gamma_2})_t = \frac{1}{2}$. By Axiom sQ3, $(\sqrt{\gamma}) \iff \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$.
 - ii) γ is $\neg \gamma_1$. Then $\alpha_t = (\sqrt{\gamma})_t = (\sqrt{\neg \gamma_1})_t = (\neg \sqrt{\gamma_1})_t = \neg(\sqrt{\gamma_1})_t$. By inductive hypothesis $\vdash \sqrt{\gamma_1} \iff (\sqrt{\gamma_1})_t$ and then $\vdash \neg \sqrt{\gamma_1} \iff \neg(\sqrt{\gamma_1})_t$. By Axiom sQ2, $\vdash \sqrt{\neg \gamma_1} \iff \neg \sqrt{\gamma_1}$. Thus $\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$.
 - iii) γ is $\sqrt{\gamma_1}$. Then $\alpha_t = (\sqrt{\sqrt{\gamma_1}})_t = (\neg \gamma_1)_t = \neg(\gamma_1)_t$. By inductive hypothesis $\vdash \gamma_1 \iff (\gamma_1)_t$ and then $\vdash \neg \gamma_1 \iff \neg(\gamma_1)_t$. By Axiom sQ1, $\vdash \sqrt{\sqrt{\gamma_1}} \iff \neg \gamma_1$. Thus $\vdash \alpha \iff \alpha_t$.

□

Taking into account the axiom sQ5, we define the following theory which plays an important role in relation to deductions on the $\mathcal{IP}$ -calculus with respect to deductions in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment.

Definition 5.10 We consider the following three groups of terms in $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$

$$T_1 = \{((\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s : x \in V \cup \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}, \bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\},$$

$$T_2 = \{((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s : x \in V \cup \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}, \bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\},$$

$$T_3 = \{((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg x) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s : x \in V \cup \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}, \bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\},$$

$$T_4 = \{((\frac{1}{4} \bullet x) \oplus ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \sqrt{x})) \rightarrow s : x \in V \cup \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}, \bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}\}.$$

Then we define:

$$T_D = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cup T_4$$

Proposition 5.11 Let $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ and $s \in Term(\frac{1}{2})$. If $\bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ then we have:

1. $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \alpha) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\alpha})) \rightarrow s)_t$ noted $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^1$
2. $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \alpha) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \sqrt{\alpha})) \rightarrow s)_t$ noted $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^2$
3. $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \alpha) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\alpha})) \rightarrow s)_t$ noted $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^3$
4. $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \alpha) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \sqrt{\alpha})) \rightarrow s)_t$ noted $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^4$

Proof: We use induction on complexity of α . The case $\alpha \in V \cup \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ is immediate from T_1 . In particular if α is 1 then we have that $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet 1) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{1})) \rightarrow s)_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet 1) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \frac{1}{2})) \rightarrow s$. Therefore it is not very hard to see that:

$$T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (\frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$$

Suppose α is $\alpha_1 \star \alpha_2$ such that $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$.

By Axiom C3 and Lemma 5.4 it follows that $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^1 \iff \alpha_t^4$ and $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t^2 \iff \alpha_t^3$. Taking into account that α_t^1 is $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \alpha_t) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$ and α_t^3 is $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \alpha_t) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$, we consider the term $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$ where $\beta \in \{\alpha_t, \neg \alpha_t\}$. Therefore we need to see that $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$. In fact:

- (1) $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (\frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$
- (2) $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}$ by Ax P3
- (3) $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}) \rightarrow (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow (\frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8}))$ by Lemma 5.4-7
- (4) $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow (\frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8})$ by MP 2,3
- (5) $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s) \rightarrow (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s)$ by Ax W2, 4 and MP
- (6) $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta) \oplus \frac{1}{8}) \rightarrow s$ MP 1,5.

Suppose α is $\neg\beta$.

1. $\alpha_t^1 = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\neg\beta})) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta}))) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = \beta_t^2$. Then, by inductive hypothesis we have that, $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta_t^2$.
2. $\alpha_t^2 = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\beta) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\sqrt{\neg\beta})) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$. By Proposition 5.4 we have:
 $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} \iff ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet (\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$
and $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet (\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} = \beta_t^1$. Then, by inductive hypothesis we have that, $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta_t^1$.
3. $\alpha_t^3 = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\neg\beta) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\neg\neg\beta})) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$
By Proposition 5.4 we have:
 $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg\neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} \iff ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$
where $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} = \beta_t^4$. Then, by inductive hypothesis we have $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta_t^4$.
4. $\alpha_t^4 = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\sqrt{\neg\beta})) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$
By Proposition 5.4 we have:
 $\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\neg(\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} \iff ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet (\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$
where $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg\beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet (\sqrt{\beta})_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s} = \beta_t^3$. Then, by inductive hypothesis we have $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta_t^3$.

Suppose α is $\sqrt{\beta}$.

$$1. \alpha_t^1 = (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\beta}) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\sqrt{\beta}})) \rightarrow \bar{s})_t = ((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\beta_t}) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \beta_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}$$

But using Proposition 5.4

$$\vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\beta_t}) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \beta_t)) \rightarrow \bar{s}) \iff (((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\beta_t})) \rightarrow \bar{s})$$

where $((\frac{1}{4} \bullet \neg \beta_t) \oplus (\frac{1}{4} \bullet \sqrt{\beta_t})) \rightarrow \bar{s} = \beta_t^3$. By inductive hypothesis we have $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \beta_t^3$.

For the rest of this case, i.e. $\alpha_t^2, \alpha_t^3, \alpha_t^4$, it follows in a similar way.

□

Theorem 5.12 *Let T be a theory and α be a term both in $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. Then we have:*

$$T \vdash \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad T_t \cup T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t$$

Proof: Suppose that $T \vdash \alpha$. We use induction on the length of the proof of α noted by $Length(\alpha)$. If $Length(\alpha) = 1$ then we have the following possibility:

1. α is one of axioms W1, $\dots$, W4, C1 $\dots$ C6 P1, $\dots$, P5. In this case α_t result an axiom of the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment.
2. α is one of the axioms sQ1, $\dots$, sQ4. In this case α_t looks like $\beta \iff \beta$ in the PMV -fragment and by Proposition 5.4 1 and 9 this terms are PMV -theorems.
3. If α is an axiom sQ5 then we use Proposition 5.11 resulting $T_{Q5} \vdash \alpha_t$
4. If $\alpha \in T$ it is clear that $\alpha_t \in T_t$.

Suppose that the theorem is valid for $Length(\alpha) < n$. We consider $Length(\alpha) = n$. Thus we have a proof of α from T as follows

$$\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \rightarrow \alpha, \dots, \alpha_m, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, \alpha$$

obtaining α by MP from $\alpha_m \rightarrow \alpha$ and α_m . Using inductive hypothesis we have $T_t \cup T_D \vdash_{PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}} (\alpha_m \rightarrow \alpha)_t$ and $T_t \cup T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} (\alpha_m)_t$. Taking into

account that $(\alpha_m \rightarrow \alpha)_t$ is $(\alpha_m)_t \rightarrow \alpha_t$, by MP we have $T_t \cup T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t$.

For the converse, suppose that $T_t \cup T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t$. Then there exist two subsets $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\} \subseteq T$ and $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\} \subseteq T_D$ such that

$$\{(\beta_1)_t, \dots, (\beta_n)_t, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\} \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t$$

Consequently $\{(\beta_1)_t, \dots, (\beta_n)_t, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\} \vdash \alpha_t$. By Lemma 5.9 we have that $\vdash \alpha \equiv \alpha_t$ and $\vdash \beta_i \equiv (\beta_i)_t$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Moreover, by Axiom sQ5, it is not very hard to see that $\vdash \gamma_j$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Thus $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\} \vdash \alpha$ and $T \vdash \alpha$. $\square$

Corollary 5.13 *Let $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. Then we have $\vdash \alpha$ iff $T_D \vdash_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_t$* $\square$

Let S_A be a $\mathcal{S}^\square$ -algebra from the $\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -chain A . Consider the $\mathcal{S}^\circ$ -algebra given by the sub algebra D_A of S_A . We introduce the following sets:

$$E_{D_A} = \{\text{interpretations } e : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow D_A\}$$

$$V_D = \{\mathcal{PMV}_{\frac{1}{2}}\text{-homomorphisms } v : Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}} \rightarrow Reg(D_A) \text{ s.t. } v(T_D) = 1\}$$

Proposition 5.14 *Let $e \in E_{D_A}$ and the restriction $v_e = e_p \upharpoonright_{Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}}$. Then the assignment $e \mapsto v_e$ is a bijection $E_{D_A} \rightarrow V_D$ such that $e_p(\alpha) = v_e(\alpha_t)$.*

Proof: We will see that $e \mapsto v_e$ is well defined in the sense that $v_e \in V_D$. Let $\alpha \in T_D$. Since $T_D \subseteq Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ then $v_e(\alpha) = e_p(\alpha)$ and $v_e(\alpha) = (\frac{a}{4} \oplus \frac{\sqrt{a}}{4}) \rightarrow \bar{s}$ for some $a \in D_A$ and $\bar{s} \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$. Since $D_A \in \mathcal{IP}$ then, $(\frac{a}{4} \oplus \frac{\sqrt{a}}{4}) \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{4\sqrt{2}}$ resulting $v_e(\alpha) = 1$. Hence $v_e(T_D) = 1$.

Suppose that $v_{e_1} = v_{e_2}$. Let t be an atomic term in $term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. Then we have that $e_{1p}(t) = v_{e_1}(t) = v_{e_2}(t) = e_{2p}(t)$ and $e_{1p}(\sqrt{t}) = v_{e_1}(\sqrt{t}) = v_{e_2}(\sqrt{t}) = e_{2p}(\sqrt{t})$. Therefore by Proposition 5.1, $e_1 = e_2$ and $e \mapsto v_e$ is injective.

Now we will prove the surjectivity. Let $v \in V_D$. For each atomic term t in $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ we define the interpretation $e : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow D_A$: such that

$e(t) = (v(t), v(\sqrt{t}))$ for each atomic term t . By induction on complexity of terms we prove that $v_e = v$. For atomic terms in $\mathcal{IP}$ it follows by definition of e . If t is an atomic terms then $e(\sqrt{t}) = (v(\sqrt{t}), \neg v(t))$ and we have that $v_e(\sqrt{t}) = v(\sqrt{t})$. That constitutes the base of the induction in the language $Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$. Now let our claim hold whenever the complexity of term is less than n and α have complexity n

- if $\alpha \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ is $\alpha_1 \star \alpha_2$ where $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ then we have that $e(\alpha) = e(\alpha_1) \star e(\alpha_2) = (v(\alpha_1) \star v(\alpha_2), \frac{1}{2})$ and $v_e(\alpha) = v(\alpha_1) \star v(\alpha_2) = v(\alpha_1 \star \alpha_2) = v(\alpha)$.
- if $\alpha \in Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}}$ is $\neg \alpha_1$ then we have that $e(\alpha) = \neg e(\alpha_1)$ and $v_e(\alpha) = \neg v_e(\alpha_1) = \neg v(\alpha_1) = v(\alpha)$.

Thus $v = v_e$ and $e \mapsto v_e$ is a bijection from E_{D_A} onto V_D .

Let $e \in E_{D_A}$. By induction on complexity of terms we prove that for each $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$, $e_p(\alpha) = v_e(\alpha_t)$. Let α be an atomic term then $e_p(\alpha) = e_p(\alpha_t) = v_e(\alpha_t)$. Now let our claim hold whenever the complexity of term is less than n and α have complexity n . If α is $\alpha_1 \star \alpha_2$ where $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$ or α is $\neg \alpha_1$, this case is routine. Suppose that α is $\sqrt{\alpha_1}$. Let us consider the following cases:

- If α_1 is an atomic term. Then it follows from the fact that $(\sqrt{\alpha_1})_t = \sqrt{\alpha_1}$.
- α is $\sqrt{\neg \alpha_1}$. Then $e_p(\alpha) = e_p(\sqrt{\neg \alpha_1}) = \neg e_p(\sqrt{\alpha_1}) = \neg v_e((\sqrt{\alpha_1})_t) = v_e(\neg(\sqrt{\alpha_1})_t) = v_e((\sqrt{\neg \alpha_1})_t) = v_e(\alpha_t)$.
- α is $\sqrt{\sqrt{\alpha_1}}$. Then $e_p(\alpha) = e_p(\sqrt{\sqrt{\alpha_1}}) = \neg e_p(\alpha_1) = \neg v_e(\alpha_{1t}) = v_e(\neg \alpha_{1t}) = v_e((\sqrt{\sqrt{\alpha_1}})_t) = v_e(\alpha)$.
- α_1 is $\sqrt{\alpha_2 \star \alpha_3}$ where $\star \in \{\oplus, \bullet\}$. Then $e_p(\alpha) = e_p(\sqrt{\alpha_2 \star \alpha_3}) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = e_p(\frac{1}{2}) = v_e((\sqrt{\alpha_2 \star \alpha_3})_t) = v_e(\alpha_t)$.

Hence $e_p(\alpha) = v_e(\alpha_t)$ for each $\alpha \in Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. □

Theorem 5.15 *Let T be a theory and α be a term both in $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$ then*

$$T \models \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad T \vdash \alpha$$

Proof: We assume that T is consistent. Suppose that $T \models \alpha$ but T does not prove α . By Theorem 5.12 $T_t \cup T_D$ does not prove α_t in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment. In view of Lemma 5.6 and Theorem 5.7 there exists a theory T' in the $PMV(\frac{1}{2})$ -fragment such that $T_t \cup T_D \subseteq T'$, T' does not prove α_t and $L_{T'}$ is a totally ordered $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -algebra. Thus $[\alpha_t] \neq 1$. If we consider the natural $PMV_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -valuation $v : Term_{PMV(\frac{1}{2})}^{\sqrt{V}} \rightarrow L_{T'}$ then $[\alpha_t] = v(\alpha_t) \neq 1$. By Proposition 5.14, there exists an interpretation $e : Term_{\mathcal{IP}} \rightarrow D_{L_{T'}}$ such that $e_p(\alpha) = v(\alpha_t) \neq 1$ which is a contradiction since $e_p(T) = 1$. The converse is immediate. $\square$

Now we can establish a compactness theorem for the quantum gates logic

Theorem 5.16 *Let T be a theory and α be a term both in $Term_{\mathcal{IP}}$. Then we have:*

$$T \models \alpha \text{ iff } \exists T_0 \subseteq T \text{ finite such that } T_0 \models \alpha$$

Proof: If $T \models \alpha$ by Theorem 5.15 there exists a proof of $\alpha, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ from T . If we consider $T_0 = \{\alpha_k \in T : \alpha_k \in \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}\}$ then $T_0 \models \alpha$. The converse is immediate. $\square$

“

References

- [1] D. Aharonov, A. Kitaev and N. Nisan, Quantum circuits with mixed states. Proc. 13th Annual ACM Symp. on Theory of Computation, 20-30 (STOC,1997).
- [2] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, The logic of quantum mechanics. Ann. Math. **27**, 823-843 (1936).
- [3] W.J. Blok and D. Pigozzi, Algebraizable logics. Mem. Am. Math. Soc., Number 396 (1989).
- [4] S. Burris and H.P. Sankappanavar, A course in Universal Algebra. Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1981).
- [5] G. Cattaneo, M. Dalla Chiara, R. Giuntini and R. Leporini, An unsharp logic from quantum computation. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **43**, 1803-1817 (2001).

- [6] R. Cignoli, M. I. D'Ottaviano and D. Mundici, Algebraic foundations of many-valued reasoning. Kluwer, Dordrecht-Boston-London (2000).
- [7] M. L. Dalla Chiara, R. Giuntini and R. Greechie, Reasoning in Quantum Theory. Kluwer, Dordrecht (2004).
- [8] M. L. Dalla Chiara, R. Giuntini and R. Leporini, Quantum computational logics. A Survey. In Trends in Logic: 50 Years of Studia Logica, V. F. Hendricks, J. Malinowski, (Editors), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 213255 (2003).
- [9] G. Domenech and H. Freytes, Fuzzy propositional logic associated with quantum computational gates. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **34**, 228-261 (2006).
- [10] R. Duan, Z. Ji, Y. Feng and M. Ying, Quantum operation, quantum Fourier transform and semi-definite programming, Phys. Lett. A **323**, 4856 (2004).
- [11] J. M. Dunn, T. J. Hagge, L. S. Moss and Z. Wang, Quantum logic as motivated by quantum computing, J. Symbolic Logic, **70** iss. 2, 353-359, (2005).
- [12] F. Esteva and L. Godo, Monoidal t-norm based logic: towards a logic for left-continuous t-norms, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, **124**, 271-288 (2001).
- [13] F. Esteva, L. Godo and F. Montagna, The $L\Pi$ and $L\Pi_{\frac{1}{2}}$: two complete fuzzy systems joining Łukasiewicz and Product Logic. Arch. Math. Logic **40**, 39-67 (2001).
- [14] H. Freytes, A. Ledda and G. Sergioli, Stone-Weierstrass type theorem in the framework of irreversible quantum computation. submitted to the Int. J. Theor. Phys. (2008).
- [15] H. Freytes, Pavelka-style completeness in expansions of Łukasiewicz logic. Arch. Math. Logic **47**, 15-23 (2008).
- [16] R. Giuntini, A. Ledda and F. Paoli, Expanding quasi-MV algebras by a quantum operator. Studia Logica **87**, 99-128 (2007).
- [17] S. Gudder, Quantum computational logic. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **42**, 39-47 (2003).
- [18] S. Gudder and R. Greechie, Sequential products on effect algebras. Rep. Math. Phys. **49**, 87-111 (2002).

- [19] S. Gudder and R. Greechie, Uniqueness and order in sequential effect algebras. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **44**, 755-770 (2005).
- [20] P. Hájek, *Metamathematics of fuzzy logic*. Kluwer, Dordrecht-Boston-London (1998).
- [21] P. Hájek, F. Esteva and L. Godo, A complete many-valued logic with product conjunction, *Arch. Math. Logic* **35**, 191-208 (1996).
- [22] U. Höhle, Commutative, residuated l-monoids. In: *Non-classical Logics and their applications to Fuzzy Subset, a Handbook on the Mathematical Foundations of Fuzzy Set Theory*, U. Höhle, E. P. Klement, (Editors). Kluwer, Dordrecht, (1995).
- [23] J.R. Isbell, Notes on ordered rings. *Algebra Universalis* **1**, 393-399 (1971).
- [24] K. Kraus, *States, effects and operations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1983).
- [25] V. Kreinovich and L. Longpré, Fast quantum computation algorithms for handling probabilistic and interval uncertainty, *Math. Log. Quart.* **50**, 507-518 (2004).
- [26] A. Ledda, M. König, F. Paoli and R. Giuntini, MV algebras and quantum computation. *Studia Logica* **82**, 245-270 (2006).
- [27] F. Montagna, An Algebraic Approach to Propositional Fuzzy logic. *J. of Logic, Language and Information* **9**, 91-124 (2000).
- [28] F. Montagna, Functorial Representation Theorems for MV_δ Algebras with Additional Operators. *J. of Algebra* **238**, 99-125 (2001).
- [29] D. Mundici and B. Riečan, Probability on MV-algebras. In: *Handbook of Measure Theory* (E. Pap Ed.), 869-909, North Holland, Amsterdam, (2002).
- [30] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2000).
- [31] F. Paoli, A. Ledda, R. Giuntini, H. Freytes, On some properties of qMV -algebras and $\sqrt{q}$ qMV -algebras. *Rep. Math. Logic*, **44**, 53-85 (2008).

- [32] V. Tarasov, Quantum computer with Mixed States and Four-Valued Logic. J. Phys. A **35**, 5207-5235 (2002).

Hector Freytes e-mail: hfreytes@gmail.com hfreytes@dm.uba.ar
Graciela Domenech e-mail: domenech@iafe.uba.ar